

Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

July 31, 2008

7:30 – 9:30 p.m. County Commission Chambers

Welcome & Review of Public Comments

- The meeting was called to order at 7:30pm by facilitators David Procter and Dan Kahl. Terrie McCants was not in attendance. Procter welcomed the group and reminded those in attendance that comment cards were available for public comments. Procter displayed the original Charge of the Committee. The facilitators briefly explained the agenda of the meeting.

Full Group Discussion on Implementation Strategies (continued)

- Last meeting, a suggestion was made to compile all the comments on each of the four (4) implementation options and send them to each Committee member for review. Continue discussion next meeting
- Before delving into the details of the individual strategies, Dan Kahl presented a “modified consensus” scale:
 - 5 – full Support
 - 4 – strong support, great idea
 - 3 – good idea, will support
 - 2 – moderate idea, acceptable
 - 1 – not acceptable
- Kahl suggested that members submitting a “1” give reasons why and possible solutions to make the idea more acceptable.
- The facilitators asked the Committee for a starting point for discussion. The Committee decided to begin work on the advantages and disadvantages of Option #4: Exclusive Ag District. Comments were logged on a flipchart and are as follows:
 1. Farmer needs to have development reviewed;
 2. Should be an exemption for residence of farmer or landowner (keep determination administrative);
 3. Could identify areas to encourage development;
 4. All development should be reviewed;
 5. Required that a Schedule F be filed;
 6. Determine if a proposed residence is actually necessary for the agricultural operation. Is the land on which the house is to be located actually associated with the agricultural operation (livestock, crops, etc.);
 7. Require an Affidavit or waiver; and
 8. No minimum lot size exemption.
- Kahl transitioned into the disadvantages of Option#4. Comments are as follows:
 1. CORRECTION: The LESA system actually gives balance between agricultural preservation and property rights (right to develop).
- A suggestion was made that if a developer or landowner scored low on the LESA, they could still build if they had 160 acres. The development would require a site plan. Through much discussion, the suggestion was not accepted by the Committee, however, a large lot (80-160 acres) minimum lot size should be considered.
- A suggestion was made that rather than rezoning isolated tracts, extraneous farmsteads, etc. with a conventional zoning, a specialized zoning district could be created that would allow a tract to be developed without effecting a LESA score of any nearby development proposals.

Next Step

- Continue analysis of the rest of the implementation options.

Next Full Committee meeting: Wednesday August 27, 2008, 7:30 PM at the County Commission Chambers

Adjourned

Attachments: Implementation Strategy Options

Implementation Strategy Options

OPTION I – Minimal Change

Advantages:

- Property owner retains current development rights
- Less land taken out of agricultural production
- Less infrastructure costs if development is clustered.
- Planning staff could influence when and where clustering should occur through requirement for a site plan and application of development standards.
- Easier for property owner to sell land in small tracts as opposed to the current minimum 20-acre requirement.
- Clustering would centralize development, minimizing fragmentation of agricultural land.
- Assumed to be the most popular option.

Disadvantages:

- Could cause conflicts with agricultural uses, with no public hearing opportunities.
- If such development were to occur in clusters and urban/rural conflicts were to develop, the political power favors the majority.
- LESA is not utilized to determine appropriateness of development.
- Development occurring by right could inadvertently increase LESA scores, thus promoting more development. (unintended consequences).
- Could generate unplanned, un-reviewed development.

OPTION II – Transfer of Development Rights

Advantages:

- It is likely to limit development because it is so confusing.
- It could raise the value of property located in the “sending” areas.
- It could benefit the owner of undevelopable land.

Disadvantages:

- Implementation of the concept is difficult to comprehend. Confusing!
- Property owner is limited to a “one-time” sale of a development right (1 right per 20 acres); subsequent owners would not have any development rights.
- The concept requires significant bureaucracy.
- It is assumed that the County would incur additional costs to administer the program.
- In order to establish the “sending” and “receiving” areas, arbitrary lines would need to be drawn on a map.
- Could lead to unplanned “negative” development.
- Appears that Riley County lacks the market for a TDR program to be successful.
- Uncontrolled Ag growth.
- Program denies development rights in “sending” areas.
- Restricts development in rural areas to the extent of negatively impacting tax areas and rural school districts, making it difficult for schools to re-populate the student body.

OPTION III – Tiered Zoning Districts

Advantages:

- All development proposals are reviewed.
- Removes uncertainty regarding the appropriateness of development; better clarity.
- Protects agricultural land.
- Directs urban/suburban development to urban areas.
- This option relies on the LESA/DGS.

Disadvantages:

- There is a concern for a loss of property rights?
- Could promote disinvestment by farmers in agricultural areas determined to be “transitional”, where preservation of agricultural uses are de-emphasized.
- Forces Committee to draw lines on a map to establish the districts.

- Could potentially create conflicts with areas that are currently zoned something other than General Agricultural.
- Concern that property located in a district zoned for agricultural preservation will devalue.

OPTION IV – Exclusive Ag District

Advantages:

- All development proposals are reviewed.
- Establishes the DGS as the primary tool in decision making, resulting in “planned development”.
- Protects agricultural land and agricultural operations.
- Doesn’t require lines to be drawn on a map.
- All citizens are given the same opportunity to have development proposals reviewed.
- Without a size requirement associated with development (20 acres), less land could be taken out of agricultural production, possibly minimizing further fragmentation of agricultural land.
- Option eliminates the 20-acre minimum lot size requirement.

Disadvantages:

- The balance between agricultural preservation and development is lost.
- Existing development rights may be lost.
- It may be easier to subdivide agricultural land and may lead to fragmentation.